

the received party identifier. The Office relies upon Figs. 9-12 which illustrate date information but not time. The 102 rejection is improper for at least this reason. In addition, Figs. 9-12 teach dates of replacement, dates of expiry, dates of delivery, and dates of installation which fail to teach or suggest the claimed *date and time information regarding reception of the received consumable identifier and received party identifier*. Claim 13 is allowable for at least this reason.

Referring to claim 32, the *communication indicates use of the consumable by an unauthorized party*. The Office relies upon the teachings in paragraph 387. However, the generic on-screen warning of paragraph 387 fails to teach or suggest the claimed communication indicates use of the consumable by an unauthorized party. The message of paragraph 1252 relates to a message stating "The toner cartridge installed is not proper. Please replace it with a proper toner cartridge" which fails to teach or suggest the claimed communication *indicating use of the consumable by an unauthorized party*. Claim 32 is allowable for at least this reason.

Referring to independent claim 1, the Office relies upon the teachings of Nagata as applied against claim 9 in support of the rejection of claim 1. At pages 8-9 of the Action, the Office recites step S45 and the teachings in paragraph 387. However, as is clear from Fig. 34, at step S45 and as described at paragraphs 369, and 385-387, the on-screen warning is displayed responsive to the result of step S33 being "no" to whether the current status is "new(spare)" and the negative response to a condition of whether the current status is "in use" of step S43. Fig. 34 fails to disclose or suggest *outputting a message responsive to the comparings (of the consumable identifiers and party identifiers recited in claim 1) to indicate use of the consumable by an unauthorized party* as defined in claim 1. Furthermore, referring to paragraph 361, the notification steps are executed if the section 122 detects the same ID number as that already registered is "used." These teachings are void of disclosing or suggesting the claimed *outputting a message responsive to the claimed comparings to indicate use of the consumable by an unauthorized party* as defined in claim 1. Applicants have failed to uncover any teachings of Fig. 83 of the claimed *outputting a message responsive to the comparings to indicate use of the consumable by an unauthorized party*.

Applicants respectfully submit that limitations of claim 1 are not disclosed nor suggested by the prior art and the 102 rejection of claim 1 is improper for at least this reason.

PDNO. 10007611-1
Serial No. 09/932,631
Amendment C